

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-16 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, and 10 are amended herein. Claims 15-16 are added herein. Support for the amendments and additions can be found throughout the application, drawings, and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. Applicants' representatives would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to them during a telephonic interview on October 5, 2006. Claim 1 of the present application and the Hanakawa et al. reference were discussed. Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner states that the "protrusion parts of the protection layer" are not disclosed in the specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that claim 14 satisfies the written description requirement, in particular with regard to the "protrusion parts of the protection layer" feature. The present application illustrates and describes that a protection layer 11A can be formed in the shape of the teeth of a comb (see, e.g., Figures 3A-3B and paragraphs [0053]-[0054] of the present application). As such, Applicants submit that the "protrusion parts of the protection parts of the protection layer" are more than adequately disclosed in the specification and, moreover, that claim 14 satisfies the written description requirement.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 conforms with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanakawa et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0005928). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 5, and 10 call for an electro-optical device including a first substrate, at least one color filter formed on the first substrate, and “a protection layer formed on a part of the first substrate so as to overlap the at least one color filter and leave a region of the first substrate where the protection layer is not formed”. Claims 1, 5, and 10 also call for a conductive member interposed between “a group including the protection layer and the first inter-substrate conduction unit, and the second inter-substrate conduction unit”.

Applicants submit that Hanakawa et al. does not disclose this subject matter. Referring to Figure 2 of Hanakawa et al., a front substrate 200 has color filters 204 formed thereon. A film 205 is disposed on the front substrate 200 and the color filters 204. As such, Applicants submit that film 205 of Hanakawa et al. corresponds with the protection layer specifically recited in claims 1, 5, and 10 of the present application.

Furthermore, Hanakawa et al. discloses a conductive member 114 disposed between a first group including front substrate 200 and a common electrode 210 and a

second group including a first lead 350, a film 303, and a back substrate 300. However, film 205 of Hanakawa et al., which corresponds to the protection layer of the present application, is not in either of these first or second groups surrounding the conductive member 114. Therefore, Applicants submit that Hanakawa et al. does not disclose an electro-optical device including a conductive member interposed between a group including a protection layer and a first inter-substrate conduction unit, and a second inter-substrate conduction unit as specifically recited in claims 1, 5, and 10 of the present application. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 5, and 10 are not anticipated by Hanakawa et al.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 5 call for an electro-optical device including a sealant bonding the first substrate and a second substrate together by extending on both the protection layer and a region of the first substrate where the protection layer is not formed. As explained above with regard to conductive member 114 of Hanakawa et al., sealant 110 of Hanakawa et al. is also disposed between the first group including front substrate 200 and common electrode 210 and the second group including first lead 350, film 303, and back substrate 300. Moreover, as stated above, film 205, which corresponds to the protection layer of the present application, is included in neither of these first or second groups. As such, Applicants submit that Hanakawa et al. does not disclose an electro-optical device including a sealant extending on both a protection layer and a region of the first substrate where the protection layer is not formed as specifically recited in claims 1 and 5 of the present application. Accordingly, for these additional reasons Applicants submit that claims 1 and 5 are not anticipated by Hanakawa et al.

Additionally, claim 10 calls for an electro-optical device including a sealant having a first region embracing a conductive member and a second region with a thickness larger than the first region the sealant bonding a first substrate and a second substrate together. Referring to Figure 2 of Hanakawa et al., sealant 110 of Hanakawa et al. has a part embracing the conductive particle 114 and a remaining part that are both the same thickness. Therefore, Applicants submit that Hanakawa et al. does not disclose an electro-optical device including a sealant having first and second regions, the second region having a thickness larger than the first region. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 10 is not anticipated by Hanakawa et al.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11 all depend from one of claims 1, 5, and 10 and therefore, for at least this same reason stated above with respect to claims 1, 5, and 10, should also be patentable.

Claim 14 calls for an electro-optical device including a protection layer “having an outer edge defining a plurality of protrusion parts of the protection layer”. As stated above, an exemplary protection layer including such a configuration is illustrated and described in the present application at paragraphs [0053]-[0054] and Figures 3A-3B. Applicants submit that Hanakawa et al. does not disclose a protection layer including such a configuration. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by Hanakawa et al.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 15-16 are added herein for substantive consideration. Claims 15-16 depend on claim 14 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also be patentable. Accordingly, favorable consideration of claims 15-16 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 12, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/DWH/sms